IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 796 of 1992

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE K.A.PUJ

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : YES

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge? : NO

S F THAKOR

Versus

DIRECTOR GENERAL AND INSPECTORGENERAL OF POLICE

Appearance:

MR YN OZA for Petitioner.

Mr. Sudhir Mehta, AGP for Respondents.

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE K.A.PUJ

Date of decision: 27/02/2002

ORAL JUDGEMENT

When this matter is called out, the learned Assistant Government Pleader has placed before this Court, a copy of letter dated 16th September 1992 written by Section Officer, Home Department, Government of Gujarat, Gandhinagar addressed to Government Solicitor, wherein it is stated that pursuant to petitioner's letter dated 24-8-1992 and considering the facts of saving the lives of more than 150 persons at the time of flood in

river 'Narmada' the petitioner was granted deemed date promotion. The petitioner's main grievance in the petition is that his junior is granted promotion with effect from 21-2-1974 and hence he should be given promotion with that deemed date. The learned Assistant Government Pleader has placed before me a copy of letter dated 8-2-1990 written by Deputy Secretary, Home Department, Government of Gujarat, Gandhinagar, wherein it is stated that the earlier list was cancelled and the petitioner was granted deemed date from 2-10-1974 as his junior, namely R.J. Patel was also granted promotion from that date. Since this was the only prayer made by the petitioner in the petition and that has already been granted to the petitioner in that letter dated 16-9-1992, nothing survives in this petition and hence the petition is disposed of as the same having become infructuous. Since the petitioner's grievance has been fully redressed, no order is required to be passed by this Court. The petition is, therefore, disposed of accordingly with no order as to costs. Rule is discharged.

2. It is, however, open for the petitioner to revive this petition in case of any difficulty.

rmr. [K.A. Puj, J.]